



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,071	04/01/2004	Reuben S. Fischman	014.0038 (MA01002)	2682
29906 7590 10/16/2007 INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C. 7150 E. CAMELBACK, STE. 325 SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251			EXAMINER RIAD, AMINE	
			ART UNIT 2113	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/817,071

Applicant(s)

FISCHMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Amine Riad

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7, 40 and 64 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-82 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### Detailed Action

Claims 1-82 have been presented for examination.

Claims 1-82 have been rejected.

Claims 7, 40, 64 have been cancelled.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

#### Claims

1, 4, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 37, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 61, 66, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 34, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kidder U.S. Patent 6,445,774.

In regard to claims 1, 34, 58

Kidder discloses a method for decision analysis and resolution, wherein an event is associated with a root cause, the method comprising the steps of:

- relating a solution to the event based on root cause; (Abstract; "An automated workflow system provides automated alarm report dissemination and processing. The automated workflow system provides a graphical interface to view and manipulate alarms reports and to automatically create and handle **event reports**

and trouble tickets. **The workflow system also allows network monitors to identify which network component within the network generated the alarm {this is the root cause}**"[Examiner considers handling an event report as solving the event])

- determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically; (Column 4; lines 49-50 " these tools automate network monitor such as ...and updating alarm report status to indicate which alarm reports have been cleared by the closing of an event") [Examiner considers when a report is cleared, it is determined that the solution resolved the event]

- automatically resolving the event when the event can be resolved

automatically;(Column 9; line 44 "These tools automate network monitor")

and providing information for resolving the event to a user when the event cannot be resolved automatically. (Column 4; line 45 "creating trouble tickets against events")

Examiner considers a trouble ticket as information presented to the user for resolving the problem.]

In regard to claims 4,37,61

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of relating a solution to a root cause includes interoperating with a trouble ticket system.(Column 4; lines 44-46

"These tools automate network monitor procedures such as creating events, assigning alarm reports to events, creating trouble tickets against events. ")

In regard to claims 9,42,66

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the

Art Unit: 2113

solution can resolve the event automatically includes using object-oriented constructs.

(Figure 4; Items 410 and 411 [a Graphical User Interface is object oriented])

In regard to claims 10,43,67

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes allowing a user to prevent automated resolution. (Column 6; line 61 “as person, one skilled in the art will recognize that the functions of the network monitors may be alternatively provided, for example, by automated or **semi automated apparatus**”)

In regard to claims 11,44,68

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of automatically resolving the event includes providing information to a user by updating a trouble ticket. (Column 9; lines 35-36 “In addition to event reports, the event database 415 may also store and maintain trouble tickets”)

In regard to claims 14,47,71

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes utilizing an object oriented model to define object constructs, wherein the constructs are then presented to the user. (Column 13; lines 18-21 “ A network monitor after creating an event report can open a trouble ticket against that event report. This is done with the client GUI which provides functions for selecting event report and trouble ticket functions.”)

In regard to claims 15,48,72

Art Unit: 2113

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes a visualization of the information for resolving the event. (Column 13; lines 21-22 "The clients GUI also provides functions for comments, remarks, and activities." Examiner considers the comment remarks and activities as visualization)

In regard to claims 16,49,73

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes a visualization of the information for resolving the event, wherein the visualization includes providing an overlay, wherein the overlay offers information about the event. (Figure 5)

In regard to claims 17,50,74

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes providing a searchable knowledge base. (Figure 4; item 415 [an event database is a searchable knowledge base])

In regard to claims 19,52,76

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the method is practiced in a network, further including the step of revising the network based on data generated while resolving the event. (Column 9; lines 3-4 "The workflow LCA automatically retrieves the alarm reports that are created by the network management system and that correspond to the created event report and enhances these alarm reports with network topology and site data")

In regard to claims 20,53,77

Art Unit: 2113

Kidder discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the step of revising the network includes revising a data store within the network based on the event resolution. (Column 13; lines 43-45 "As changes in status are received, the automated workflow system corresponding updates associated event and alarm reports")

In regard to claims 21,54,78

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the method is practiced in a network, further including the step of distributing solutions in the network. (Summary "Alarm report which correspond to alarms generated by the telecommunication network, are provided by a network management system to network monitors. The network monitor can use the event report in resolving the alarm report") [Examiner considers resolving the different alarms coming from different part of the network as distributing resolution]

In regard to claims 23,56,80

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the event is associated with a security fault. (Figure 3; item 301a network component could a firewall which is a security component)

In regard to claims 24,57,81

Kidder discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the event is associated with a network operational fault. (Column 5; lines 34-36)

In regard to claim 25

Kidder discloses a network system configured to resolve network problem events correlated to root causes in an object-oriented environment, including:

Art Unit: 2113

- a resolution module configured to generate a proposed response to the detected event; (Figure 2; item 204)
- and a solution module configured to resolve the detected event using the proposed response, wherein the resolution module is configured to cooperate with the solution module to automatically implement the proposed response, (Figure 2; item 203) wherein the resolution module is configured to cooperate with the solution module to present the proposed response as a suggested response to resolve the detected event. (Column 6; lines 55-58)

In regard to claim 26

Kidder discloses the system of claim 25, further including a user input module configured to allow a network user to initiate implementation of the proposed response. (Column 6; lines 60-61)

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 35, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S. Patent 6,445,774 in view of Valadarsky U.S. Patent 7,043,661.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1, 34, and 58



Art Unit: 2113

Kidder does not disclose the step of relating a solution to a root cause includes utilizing a solutions catalog.

Valadarsky teaches that the step of relating a solution to a root cause includes utilizing a solution catalog. (Column 2; lines 39-41 "TRS stores its results in a history database. Users can review the decision it made, and the alarm groups it correlated, long after the faults that generated those decisions and alarm groups have been resolved") [Examiner considers the decision it made as solutions]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate utilizing a solution catalog of Valadarsky into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply utilizing a solution catalog of Valadarsky because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Valadarsky discloses "the present invention relates to apparatus and methods for fault management"

Claims 3,36,60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Valadarsky U.S Patent 7,043,661.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose relating a solution to a root cause includes chaining a series of solution objects to the root cause

Art Unit: 2113

Valadarsky teaches relating a solution to a root cause includes chaining a series of solution objects to the root cause (Column 2; lines 12-13 "TRS uses graph traverse in order to find the root")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate chaining a series of solution object to the root cause of Valadarsky into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply chaining a series of solution object to the root cause of Valadarsky because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Valadarsky discloses, "the present invention relates to apparatus and methods for fault management"

Claims 8,41,65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Valadarsky U.S Patent 7,043,661.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58

Kidder does not disclose the steps of determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statistically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event

Valadarsky teaches the steps of determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statistically significant

Art Unit: 2113

correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event. (Column 2; line 16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statistically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event of Valadarsky into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply utilizing whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statistically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event of Valadarsky because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Valadarsky discloses "the present invention relates to apparatus and methods for fault management"

Claims 5,38,62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically utilizes the intelligence and the relationships to evaluate the validity of the solution.

Art Unit: 2113

Paradies teaches determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically utilizes the intelligence and the relationships to evaluate the validity of the solution (Figure 24; item = Corrective Action Helper)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically utilizes the intelligence and the relationships to evaluate the validity of the solution of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply utilizing whether the solution can resolve the event automatically utilizes the intelligence and the relationships to evaluate the validity of the solution of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 6,39,63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58

Kidder does not disclose that the validity of the solution is based upon previous success in resolving the event and descriptions of the related root cause

Art Unit: 2113

Paradies teaches that the validity of the solution is based upon previous success in resolving the event and descriptions of the related root cause (Figure 22; item =comment editor)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate basing the solution upon previous success in resolving the event of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply basing the solution upon previous success in resolving the event of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 8,41,65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event.

Art Unit: 2113

Paradies teaches determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event. (Column 14; lines 35-40)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply determining whether the solution can resolve the event automatically includes determining whether a root cause has a statically significant correlation with a defined set of tasks leading to a resolution of the event of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 12,45,69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose presenting the user with suggested corrective actions

Paradies teaches presenting the user with suggested corrective actions (Column 3; lines 52-54 and figure 24)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate presenting the user with suggested corrective actions of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply presenting the user with suggested corrective actions of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 13,46,70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes evaluating the strength of relationships between a root cause construct and a resolution construct

Paradies teaches the step of providing information for resolving the event to a user includes evaluating the strength of relationships between a root cause construct and a resolution construct (Column 14; lines 54-59)

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the strength of relationships between a root cause construct and a resolution construct of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the strength of relationships between a root cause construct and a resolution construct of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 22,27,55,79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose creating heuristics related to the solution, wherein the heuristics are configured to be available within the network to evaluate proposed solutions.

Paradies teaches creating heuristics related to the solution, wherein the heuristics are configured to be available within the network to evaluate proposed solutions. (Column 16; lines 65-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate creating heuristics related to the solution, wherein the



heuristics are configured to be available within the network to evaluate proposed solutions of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply creating heuristics related to the solution, wherein the heuristics are configured to be available within the network to evaluate proposed solutions of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 18,51,75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose providing information for resolving the event to a user includes presenting a probability, wherein the probability is indicative of the success of the solution.

Paradies teaches providing information for resolving the event to a user includes presenting a probability, wherein the probability is indicative of the success of the solution.(Column 14; lines 65-66 [the number is considered as an association probability])

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate providing information for resolving the event to a user includes presenting a probability, wherein the probability is indicative of the success of the solution of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply providing information for resolving the event to a user includes presenting a probability, wherein the probability is indicative of the success of the solution of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to correlate proposed responses to successful and unsuccessful resolution of similar detected events.

Paradies teaches that the heuristic module is configured to correlate proposed responses to successful and unsuccessful resolution of similar detected events.(Column 14; lines 59-61)

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to correlate proposed responses to successful and unsuccessful resolutions of detected events of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to correlate proposed responses to successful and unsuccessful resolutions of detected events of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claims 29, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1, 34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to solicit new responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events.

Paradies teaches that the heuristic module is configured to solicit new responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events.

(Column 14; lines 59-61)

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to solicit new responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to solicit new responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

In regard to claim 30

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S. Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S. Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to present suggested responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events. (Column 14; lines 64-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to present suggested

Art Unit: 2113

responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to present suggested responses to detected events based upon previous successful resolutions of similar detected events of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

In regard to claim 32

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events.

Paradies teaches that the heuristic module is configured to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events.(Column 11; lines 16-17 "at any level of analysis is considered as a predetermined success threshold")

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidder U.S Patent 6,445,774 in view of Paradies U.S Patent 6,463,441.

Kidder discloses the method for decision analysis and resolution of parent claims 1,34, and 58.

Kidder does not disclose that the heuristic module is configured to generate responses based upon a predetermined success threshold for previously detected events.

Paradies teaches that the heuristic module is configured to generate responses based upon previous optional responses once a success threshold for the previous optional responses has been reached (Column 11; lines 16-17 "at any level of analysis is considered as a predetermined success threshold ")

Art Unit: 2113

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate configuring the heuristic module to generate responses based upon a previous optional responses once a success threshold for the previous optional responses has been reached of Paradies into the method for decision analysis and resolution of Kidder. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply configuring the heuristic module to generate responses based upon a previous optional responses once a success threshold for the previous optional responses has been reached of Paradies because as Kidder discloses in the background "The present invention relates to the detection, reporting, and resolution of anomalies in network", additionally Paradies discloses "More specifically, the invention is directed to a system for identifying a human action that represents an underlying cause of an incident, and suggesting corrective action to reduce the probability of a future occurrence"

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 82 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grace U.S. Patent 5,748,098.

Grace discloses a computer method for analyzing and resolving a fault within a computing system, comprising the steps of:

- Associating the fault with a root cause; (Column 3; lines 50-51)

- Relating a solution to the fault based on the root cause; (Column 3; lines 54-55)
- Automatically resolving the event, by the computing system, if the root cause has a statistically significant correlation with a set of tasks leading to the solution; (Column 2; lines 51-52) and (Column 2; lines 65-67) and (Column 3; lines 5-10)
- providing information for resolving the event to a user if the root cause does not have a statistically significant correlation with any set of tasks leading to the solution. (Column 4; lines 16-22)

#### **Response to Applicant's Argument**

Applicant arguments filed on July 30, 2007 have been fully considered and are not persuasive.

In regard the first argument which states that "Among other elements, independent claim 1 defines a method for decision analysis and resolution comprising the step of "automatically resolving the event when the event can be resolved automatically"

Applicants submit that Kidder fails to disclose at least these elements of claim 1"

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner points out that the abstract states, "An automated workflow system provides automated alarm report dissemination and processing. The automated workflow system provides a graphical interface to view and manipulate alarm reports and to automatically create and handle event reports trouble tickets " Applicant's argument is not valid.



Art Unit: 2113

In regard the second argument which states, "Applicants submit that the system in Kidder does not actually resolve or fix any problems, but rather, notifies field engineers of the problem, which field engineers then fix any problem" Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner points Applicant to two sections of the present reference. First to the summary where Kidder discloses "Embodiments of the present invention provide methods and systems for automating the dissemination and processing of alarm reports received from a telecommunications network. Alarm reports, which correspond to alarms generated by the telecommunications network, are provided by a network management system to network monitors. A network monitor can select one or more alarm reports for grouping into an event report. **The network monitor can use the event report in resolving the alarm report** and *can also use the event report in resolving the alarm report to produce a trouble ticket* for further processing by a service management system, such as a trouble management system, such as a trouble management system ("TMS")". Second, Examiner points Applicant to Figure 8 which shows event handling, and at step 911 it shows that the alarms are viewed, and that there is an event: take action, which means solve the problem. Additionally, figure 9 shows trouble ticket handling which is different from event handling a ticket. As shown before Kidder tackles in figure 8 automatically solving the problem by taking an automatic action and not by consulting the field engineer as advanced by the Applicant. Argument is not valid.

Art Unit: 2113

In regard to the third argument which states "In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not cite Valadarsky as teaching or suggesting the elements of "automatically resolving the event when the event can be resolved automatically" Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner points out that Valadarsky was introduced not to cure the automation limitation recited in independent claims 1 and 65, instead this reference was introduced to cover other limitation in claims 2-3,5-6,35,36,38,39 where there is no automation recited. The argument is not correct.

In regard to the fourth argument which states "In making the rejection, the Patent Office does not cite Paradies as teaching or suggesting the elements "automatically resolving the event when the event can be resolved automatically"" Examiner points out that Valadarsky was introduced not to cure the automation limitation recited in independent claims 1 and 25,34, 58, instead this reference was introduced to cover other limitation in claims 5-6,8,12-13,18,22,31-33,38-39,41,45-46,51,55,62-63,65,69-70 and 75-76 where there is no automation recited. The argument is not correct.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2113

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amine Riad whose telephone number is 571-272-8185. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on 571-272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR  
Amine Riad  
Patent Examiner  
10/2/07

  
ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL  
SUPERVISOR/PATENT EXAMINER  
ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER 2100